REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are all the claims pending in the application. Applicants editorially amend

claims 2-8, 10-18 and 20. No new matter is added.

Claim objections

Claims 2-8, 10-18 and 20 are objected to because of minor informalities.

In view of the claim amendments submitted herewith, Applicants respectfully request the

Examiner to withdraw the claim objections.

Claim rejections

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-19 and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Barrett (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,280; hereinafter "Barrett") in view of newly

cited Byrnes (U.S. publication No. 2002/0002705). Applicants respectfully traverse the

rejection.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "after the setting up the connection, exchanging service

configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands that

the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret." The Examiner

acknowledges that Barrett fails to teach or suggest these features of claim 1. However, the

Examiner asserts Byrnes allegedly discloses these features of claim 1 which are missing in

Barrett, and contends it would have been obvious to modify Barrett's system with the teaching o

Byrnes "in order to provide the mobile devices to access interactive online services and

applications that suitable for updating user profiles on portable computerized devices such as

mobile phone or PDA for keeping the cost and weight of the mobile devices down." Applicants

respectfully disagree with the Examiner for at least the following reasons.

8

Byrnes is directed to a system allowing updating of profiles on portable computerized

devices. The computer profile update system of Byrnes comprises an update control computer

arranged to communicate with a user computer; a profile being held in a memory which is

associated with user computer and/or with the user; and the update control computer being

configured to communicate suggested profile updates to the user computer, wherein if the

suggested profile updates are accepted, corresponding updates are made to the profile in the

memory (paragraph [0005]). However, Barrett does not teach or suggest exchanging service

configuration data between the terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands that

the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret.

Specifically, in FIG. 2, Byrnes discloses a schematic diagram of a mobile communication

system incorporating the profile updating system. This mobile communication system includes a

user computer in the form a mobile device 100 in communication with a wireless network 120,

such as a digital cellular network. Further, the system includes a WAP (*Wireless Application

Protocol*) gateway 130 acting as an update control computer in communication with network 120

and a memory in the form of profile database 140. The WAP gateway 130 generates a profile

update message that includes the changes suggested to be made to the user's profile. This

message is transmitted across the wireless network 120 to the mobile device 100 and the

suggested changes are displayed to the user (paragraph [0012] - [0016]). Therefore, according to

Byrnes, a profile update message is transmitted through the wireless network, and does not teach

or suggest exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by means

of selected AT commands that the AT command management means of said device are able to

interpret.

That is, according to Byrnes the user mobile device 100 communicates with the WAP

gateway 130 <u>using wireless network</u> and the profile update message generated by the WAP

gateway 130 is provided to the mobile device 100 <u>through the wireless network</u>. However,

providing profile update messages through wireless network does not teach or suggest

exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device by <u>means of selected</u>

<u>AT commands</u> that the AT command management means of said device are able to interpret. In

fact, Applicant's specification on page 1, lines 25-34 describes that the user being obliged to

connect <u>to the network</u> to download the modifications or additions, which involves a charge and

monopolizes unnecessarily a connection that could be used by another user as being

unsatisfactory as being one of the problems of the prior art system that the claimed invention

attempts to address.

Additionally, Barrett fails to disclose exchanging service configuration data between the

terminal and the device by means of selected AT commands <u>after the setting up of the</u>

<u>connection</u>.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over the combined

teachings of Barrett and Byrnes at least because the combined references fail to teach or suggest

all of the features of the claimed invention.

<u>Claim 9</u>

Applicants submit that claim 9 recites subject matter analogous to claim 1, and therefore

is allowable for at least the reasons discussed above with regard to claim 1.

<u>Claims 2-3, 5-8, 10, 12-19 and 22-26</u>

Applicants submit that claims 2-3, 5-8, 10, 12-19 and 22-26 depend from either claim 1

or 9, and therefore are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency.

With regard to claim 25, Applicants submit that Barrett and Byrnes do not teach or

suggest "wherein the exchanging service configuration data between the terminal and the device

by means of selected AT commands comprises the terminal sending the device AT commands

for at least one of reading, modifying, deleting and adding to a profile stored in a memory in the

device."

Specifically, as described above, Byrnes merely discloses WAP gateway 130 acting as an

update control computer and communicating to the mobile device 100 through wireless network

(paragraph [0013]). However, this does not teach or suggest "the terminal <u>sending the device</u>

AT commands <u>for at least one of reading, modifying, deleting</u> and adding to a profile stored in a

memory in the device."

Claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 4 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable

over Barrett in view of Byrnes and Chandra (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0138582).

Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over

Barrett in view of Byrnes and Rouse (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0159136).

Applicants traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 4 and 11

Applicants respectfully submit that since claims 4 and 11 depend from one of the independent claims that is allowable, and since Chandra does not cure the deficiencies noted above with regard to claim 1, claims 4 and 11 are allowable at least by virtue their dependency.

Claims 20-21

Applicants respectfully submit that since claims 20-21 depend from claim 1 and since Rouse does not cure the deficiencies noted above with regard to claim 1, claims 20-21 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency and the additional limitations therein.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Ebenesar D. Thomas/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   Ebenesar D. Thomas
Telephone: (202) 293-7060   Registration No. 62,499
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 6, 2009

12